

## UNITED STATE DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231

| APPLICATION NO.                         | FILING DATE        | FIRST NAMED | INVENTOR |             | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. |
|---|--------------------|-------------|----------|-------------|---------------------|
| 09/198,376                              | 11/24/98           | окамото     |          | А           | NU-98035            |
| -                                       |                    | QM02/1206   | 一        | EXAMINER    |                     |
| WHITHAM CURTIS AND WHITHAM              |                    |             |          | FLANIGAN, A |                     |
| RESTON INTERNATIONAL CENTER             |                    |             |          | ART UNIT    | PAPER NUMBER        |
| 11800 SUNRISE VALLEY DRIVE<br>SUITE 900 |                    |             | 3743     |             |                     |
| RESTON VA 1                             | 201 <del>9</del> 1 |             |          | DATE MAILED | :<br>12/06/00       |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks** 

| Advisory | Acti      |
|----------|-----------|
| Advisory | 700 (GE): |

| Application No.   | Applicant(s)   |  |  |
|-------------------|----------------|--|--|
| 09/198,376        | OKAMOTO ET AL. |  |  |
| Examiner          | Art Unit       |  |  |
| Allen J. Flanigan | 3743           |  |  |

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

| THE REPLY FILED 27 November 2000 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.   |
|--|
| PERIOD FOR REPLY [check only a) or b)]   |
| a) The period for reply expires 5 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.  In view of the early submission of the proposed reply (within two months as set forth in MPEP § 707.07 (f)), the period for reply expires on the mailing date of this Advisory Action, OR continues to run from the mailing date of the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.  |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). |
| 1 A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.   |
| 2. The proposed amendment(s) will be entered upon the timely submission of a Notice of Appeal and Appeal Brief with requisite fees.  |
| 3. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:  |
| (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search. (see NOTE below);  |
| (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter. (see Note below);  |
| (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the<br>issues for appeal; and/or  |
| (d)  they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims. NOTE:   |
| 4. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):  |
| 5. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).  |
| 6. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.  |
| 7. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.   |
| 8. For purposes of Appeal, the status of the claim(s) is as follows (see attached written explanation, if any):  |
| Claim(s) allowed:  |
| Claim(s) objected to:  |
| Claim(s) rejected: <u>1, 4-6, 11-19, and 26-30</u> .   |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:   |
| 9. The proposed drawing correction filed on a) has b) has not been approved by the Examiner.   |
| 10. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s)   |
| 11. ☐ Other:  Allen J. Flanigan Primary Examiner Art Unit: 3743  |

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

Continuation of 6. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: With all due respect, it would appear that the applicants are misunderstanding the prior art in failing to recognize that Neuman is concerned with ELECTRICAL conductivity, as opposed to thermal conductivity, which is what Benson et al. (and the instant claims) are concerned with. This disparity was clearly pointed out in the previous Advisory Action, which cited lines 18-28 of column 13 of Benson et al, clearly recognizing that vanadium oxide has high thermal radiant conductivity or emittance when in an electrically insulative state, and vise-versa. Thus there is clearly no inconsistency between the disclosure of Neuman, which is concerned with electrical conductivity, and Benson, which recognize that at high temperatures, VO2 is electrically insulative and thermally emissive; at temperatures below the transition tempurature, VO2 is electrically conductive and thermally non-emissive. Interestingly, the language of claim 11 stating that the substance "exhibits the emissivity characteristics of an insulator at high temperature and characteristics of a metal at low temperature, having a low emissivity at low temperature and high emissivity at high temperature" mirrors precisely the language of Benson et al., lines 18-25 of column 13

## ATTACHMENT TO AND MODIFICATION OF NOTICE OF ALLOWABILITY (PTO-37)

(November, 2000)

NO EXTENSIONS OF TIME ARE PERMITTED TO FILE CORRECTED OR FORMAL DRAWINGS, OR A SUBSTITUTE OATH OR DECLARATION, notwithstanding any indication to the contrary in the attached Notice of Allowability (PTO-37).

If the following language appears on the attached Notice of Allowability, the portion lined through below is of no force and effect and is to be ignored<sup>1</sup>:

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE to comply with the requirements noted below is set to EXPIRE THREE MONTHS FROM THE "DATE MAILED" of this Office action. Failure to comply will result in ABANDONMENT of this application. Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Similar language appearing in any attachments to the Notice of Allowability, such as in an Examiner's Amendment/Comment or in a Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948, is also to be ignored.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> The language which is crossed out is contrary to amended 37 CFR 1.85(c) and 1.136. See "Changes to Implement the Patent Business Goals", 65 Fed. Reg. 54603, 54629, 54641, 54670, 54674 (September 8, 2000), 1238 Off. Gaz. Pat. Office 77, 99, 110, 135, 139 (September 19, 2000).